



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,268	09/11/2006	Michael Soeberdt	041165-9094-00	1228

23409 7590 06/03/2009
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE
Suite 3300
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

DAVIS, ZINNA NORTINGTON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/550,268

Applicant(s)

SOEBERDT ET AL.

Examiner

Zinna Northington Davis

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 1-15 are pending.
2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-5 and 15, drawn to a chemical compound, a medicament, and a pharmaceutical composition using the compound of formula (I).

Group II, claim(s) 6, drawn to a method of treating disorders, diseases or conditions responsive to the inactivation or activation of melanocortin-4- receptor in a mammal using the chemical compound of formula I wherein the disorder, diseases or conditions are not identified.

Group III, claim(s) 6, drawn to a method of preventing disorders, diseases or conditions responsive to the inactivation or activation of melanocortin-4- receptor in a mammal using the chemical compound of formula I wherein the disorder, diseases or conditions are not identified.

Group IV, claim(s) 7, drawn to a method of treating cancer cachexia using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group V, claim(s) 7, drawn to a method of preventing cancer cachexia using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group VI, claim(s) 8, drawn to a method of treating muscle wasting using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group VII, claim(s) 8, drawn to a method of preventing muscle wasting using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group VIII, claim(s) 9, drawn to a method of treating anorexia using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group IX, claim(s) 9, drawn to a method of preventing anorexia using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group X, claim(s) 10, drawn to a method of treating anxiety and/or depression using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group XI, claim(s) 10, drawn to a method of preventing anxiety and/or depression using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group XII, claim(s) 11, drawn to a method of treating obesity using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group XIII, claim(s) 11, drawn to a method of preventing obesity using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group XIV, claim(s) 12, drawn to a method of treating diabetes mellitus using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group XV, claim(s) 12, drawn to a method of preventing diabetes mellitus using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group XVI, claim(s) 13, drawn to a method of treating male or female sexual dysfunction using the chemical compound of formula I wherein the male sexual dysfunction is not erectile dysfunction.

Group XVII, claim(s) 13, drawn to a method of preventing male or female sexual dysfunction using the chemical compound of formula I wherein the male sexual dysfunction is not erectile dysfunction.

Group XVIII, claim(s) 14, drawn to a method of treating erectile dysfunction using the chemical compound of formula I.

Group XIX, claim(s) 14, drawn to a method of preventing erectile dysfunction using the chemical compound of formula I.

3. The inventions listed as Groups I and XIX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Inventions I -XIX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See claims 6-14.

4. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

5. The application does not meet the requirement for Unity of Invention for the following reasons:

a) the permissible combinations under Annex B, Part 1(e) are lacking and b) a common structure is not present under Annex B, Part 1(f) in which the utility is attributed. See the radicals as defined by formula I such as A, D, X, Cy, R₁, R₂, R₃, R₄, R₅, R₇, R₉, and R₁₀.

6. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

(a) The inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

(b) The inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

(c) The prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention; and

(d) The inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may

be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

8. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

10. Due to the complexity of the restriction requirement, a written request is made.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zinna Northington Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0682.

12. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Zinna Northington Davis/
Zinna Northington Davis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625